

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action mailed April 21, 2004, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. In this Response, no claims are added, canceled, or amended, so that claims 1-17 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-8, 10, and 12-17 were again rejected as anticipated by Fukuda et al. (US Patent 6,163,318, hereinafter Fukuda). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Improper Finality Of Rejection

In the Amendment filed February 2, 2004, Applicants argued, with respect to claim 1, that Fukuda fails to teach a managing means for outputting processing requests that request the execution of a monitoring process, where the processing requests are output at output periods that are different for respective windows. In the Response to Arguments, the Official Action attempts to rebut Applicants' argument by asserting that the patent to Ho et al. (US Patent 5,739,821, hereinafter Ho) discloses that claim limitation. However, claim 1 was rejected as anticipated by Fukuda, not as obvious over Fukuda in view of Ho. If claim 1 is now rejected as obvious over Fukuda in view of Ho then the rejection has improperly been made final because no claims were amended in response to the first Official Action. Therefore, Applicants request the finality of the rejection of the Official Action of April 21, 2004 be withdrawn.

The Prior Rejection Is Erroneous

The Official Action is not responsive to Applicants' arguments, and fails to rebut them. Therefore, the rejection is erroneous and should be withdrawn. In the Amendment filed February 2, 2004, Applicants argued, with respect to claim 1:

In the present invention, the processing requests are output periodically at output periods. By contrast, Fukuda only detects the overlapping state of windows when a new window is initialized or when a window graph needs to be displayed, due to an update in the windows management table resulting from a movement, resizing, or inversion of the window (see Figs. 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 16 of Fukuda). Thus, the overlapping state is not detected according to a periodic request, but is instead detected only when a new window is added or an existing window is altered.

The Official Action failed to respond to this argument. The Official Action failed to rebut the contention that the processing requests of Fukuda are output in response to the addition of a new window, not an output period.

Applicants further argued:

Moreover, the detection of the overlapping state of windows is not performed at a different period for each respective window. In the process of Fukuda, the overlapping state of each of the windows is checked at the same time, i.e. when the window graph is displayed (see S21 of Figs. 6 and 7 of Fukuda). Thus, even if Fukuda did check the overlapping state of windows periodically, which it does not, the detection requests are output at the same output period for each respective window, since the overlapping state for all windows is determined from a single read of the window management table 5 (see Figure 5 of Fukuda).

The Official Action also failed to respond to this argument. The Official Action failed to rebut the contention that the processing requests of Fukuda are output at different output periods. Applicants further argued:

Still further, Fukuda does not disclose outputting the processing result to the windows corresponding to the monitoring process. In Fukuda, the processing result, i.e., the overlapping state of each window, is output in the form of a window graph. The overlapping state for each window is not displayed in that corresponding window (see column 4, lines 47-50 of Fukuda).

The Official Action also failed to respond to this argument. The Official Action failed to rebut the contention that the processing results of Fukuda are not displayed in corresponding windows.

Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it (see MPEP § 707.07(f)). In order to present fully developed issues in any appeal, Applicants respectfully request a detailed response to Applicants' traversal of the rejection. If the rejection is to be maintained, the Examiner should respond to Applicants' arguments by demonstrating that the display of overlapping graphs in Fukuda is periodic, and that the period for such display is different with respect to different windows.

In the Amendment filed February 2, 2004, Applicants argued with respect to claims 6, 7, and 16 that Fukuda does not teach a timer of any kind. The Official Action attempts to rebut this contention by noting that Fukuda discloses a "subroutine program forming the process of the windows in steps at a time formation." Applicants fail to understand how that disclosure teaches a device for measuring time. Fukuda only discloses that the windows management table is formed at the time of formation of the windows (see column 4, lines 45-57 of Fukuda). That teaching in no way requires or suggests the use of a timer.

Regarding claim 8, Fukuda fails to teach an input means for specifying a portion of a window wherein the managing means outputs a processing request that requests execution, by the programmable controller, of a monitoring process relating only to the portion of the window specified, and receives a processing result of the monitoring process of the programmable controller that relates only to the portion of the window specified, based on the processing request. Fukuda does not teach that a processing request or a processing result relates only to a specified portion of the window (see generally columns 3-5 of Fukuda).

Thus, Fukuda fails to teach all of the limitations of any of claims 1-8, 10, and 12-17. The rejection is erroneous and should be withdrawn.


Claims 9 and 11 were rejected as unpatentable over Fukuda in view of Ho et al. (US Patent 5,739,821, hereinafter Ho). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 11, as noted above, Fukuda does not teach or suggest the limitations that the Official Action contends Fukuda teaches or suggests. Moreover, Ho does not teach or suggest the limitations not taught by Fukuda. The Official Action contends that Ho teaches outputting processing requests at output periods that are different for respective windows. That contention is simply incorrect. Ho discloses only the display of windows, and the updating of windows – there is nothing in Ho that teaches or suggests periodically updating windows in response to a periodic processing request, wherein the period is different for respective windows (see column 5, lines 1-50 and column 8, lines 17-67 of Ho). In fact, Ho does not mention a period at all.

Thus, the combination of Fukuda and Ho fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 9 and 11. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established, and the rejection should be withdrawn.


Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey A. Wyand, Reg. No. 29,458
LEYDIE, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date.



Amendment or ROA - Final (Rev. 9/3/03)